arXiv:1407.1403v4 [cs.LO] 23 Oct 2014

# Satisfiability formula in CNF for the decision version of maximum matching

Prabhu Manyem
University of Newcastle
Callaghan NSW Australia

October 24, 2014

**Abstract**

We provide a formula for the lower bound in the form of $|F| \geq K$, in such a way that the decision version of unweighted non-bipartite matching can be solved in polynomial time. The parameter $K$ can vary from instance to instance. We assume that the domains, the set of vertices and the set of edges, are ordered. To our knowledge, no polynomially solvable satisfiability expression has been developed for this problem so far, or for that matter, for any decision problem derived from optimization. Hence for such problems, this opens up a new approach to solving them.

**Keywords**. Computational complexity, Satisfiability, Constraint satisfaction.

**AMS classification**. 90C99, 68Q19, 68Q15, 68Q17, 03C13.

## 1 Introduction

We represent decision versions of optimization problems as a conjunction of a single objective function constraint (OFC) and a set of basic feasibility constraints (BFC). In other words, such a decision problem $\mathcal{P}$ can be expressed as

$\mathcal{P} \equiv$ BFC $\wedge$ OFC.

The OFC comprises the single constraint $|F| \geq K$ for decision problems based on maximization, and $|F| \leq K$ for those based on minimization. Here $|F|$ is a measure of the size of the objective function. The OFC expresses an upper or lower bound on the size of the set $F$.

The arity of the predicate[1] $F$ can vary. For instance, for a graph $G = (V, E)$, if $F \subseteq V$, $F$ will be unary (of arity one). However, if $F \subseteq E$, $F$ will be binary (of arity two). In this paper, we will express the lower bound, $|F| \geq K$, on a subset $F$ of a given edge set $E$. The parameter $K$ can vary from instance to instance.

[1] We may say that a **unary** predicate $F$ is a **subset** of a **universe** $V = \{1, 2, 3, \cdots, n\}$. Let us illustrate the terminology with an example. Suppose $V = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$, and suppose an algorithm decides that $F(1)$, $F(3)$ and $F(5)$ are true. Then we conclude that $F = \{1, 3, 5\}$, and $\neg F$ (the complement of $F$), is equal to $\{2, 4\}$. If the algorithm determines that $F(2)$ and $F(5)$ are true, then we say that $F$ and $\neg F$ are equal to $\{2, 5\}$ and $\{1, 3, 4\}$ respectively. Thus $F \subseteq V$. Similarly if $F$ is binary, then $F \subseteq V \times V$.

*Example*: Suppose $E$ consists of the edges $i$, $1 \leq i \leq 7$. Considering predicate $F$, assume that $F(1)$, $F(3)$, $F(6)$ and $F(7)$ are true, and let the rest, $F(2)$, $F(4)$ and $F(5)$ be false. In other words, $F = \{1, 3, 6, 7\}$. If $K = 3$, then the OFC $|F| \geq K$ is satisfied. On the other hand, if $K = 5$, the constraint has been violated.

In the case of Matching (Problem 1), we need to determine an $F$ ($\subseteq E$) which also satisfies the BFC in Sec. 2. For $x \in E$, we say that $F(x)$ is true if and only if $x$ is a *matched* edge. The decision version of unweighted non-bipartite matching can be formally defined as follows.

**Problem 1.** ***Unweighted non-bipartite matching***. *Given an undirected graph $G = (V, E)$ and a non-negative integer $K$, is there a matching $F$ in $G$, with $F \subseteq E$, such that*
*(i)* (The BFC) *If two edges $x$ and $y$ meet at a vertex, then at least one of them should* ***not*** *be matched; and*
*(ii)* (The OFC) *The number $|F|$ of matched edges is at least $K$?*
*Assume that (i) $G$ has no self-loops; (ii) $G$ is connected; (iii) $G$ has at most one edge between any pair of vertices; and (iv) $K \geq 2$.* □

We let $n = |V|$ and $m = |E|$.

### 1.1 Significance: Decision problems derived from optimization

To our knowledge, no polynomially solvable satisfiability expression has been developed for the decision version of unweighted non-bipartite matching so far, or for that matter, for any decision problem derived from optimization.

Hence for such problems, this opens up a new approach to solving them.

### 1.2 Notation and List of Predicates Used

Given two integers $a$ and $b$ where $a < b$, the set $\big[a, b\big]$ within square brackets represents the set of integers $\{a, a+1, \cdots, b-1, b\}$.

We write "$\forall xyz$" as shorthand for "$\forall x \forall y \forall z$".

For ease of readability, we sometimes write "edge $x$" in place of "edge $e_x$" (subscripts and superscripts are harder to read). We will use $F(x)$ as shorthand for $F(e_x)$ and use $L(i, x)$ as shorthand for $L(i, e_x)$.

There are two types of predicates, the *knowns* and the *unknowns*.

The *knowns* can be determined from the graph input $G = (V, E)$, or from the particular value that a universal quantifier can assume in a certain clause (we use $s$, $t$, $x$ and $y$ for universal quantifiers).

The *unknowns*, called "decision variables" in optimization terminology, are the ones to be determined by some SAT (satisfiability) solver.

**Remark 2.** *Bounds, such as the upper/lower bounds on the number of positive/negative literals in a clause, apply only to the unknown predicates, not the known ones.* □

For example, the Horn condition (that the number of positive literals in a clause must be at most one) applies only to the unknown predicates.

### 1.2.1 The knowns

(a) Let's assume that the edges in $E$ are ordered in a certain sequence. Since $|E| = m$, we can write this sequence as the edges $e_1$, $e_2$, $\cdots$, $e_m$, in that order.

Given the ordered sequence $E$, the first and last edges in $E$ are $e_1$ and $e_m$ respectively.

(b) Define another set $N$, also based on $E$, as follows:

$N = \{0, 1, 2, \cdots, m\} = [0, m]$.

The difference is that $E$ is a set of edges, whereas $N$ is a set of non-negative integers. $N$ is an index set (a set of indices).

(c) The truth values of relations such as $(x < y)$ and $(s > t)$ can be determined from the particular value(s) assumed by $x$, $y$, $s$ and $t$ in a certain clause.

### 1.2.2 The unknowns

(e) Unary $F$, used in Def. 1.

(f) Binary $L$, described below.

Define a binary relation $L(i, x)$ such that $i \in N$ and $x \in E$. Examples will be provided in Sec. 3.

We do not need $L$ to be a function; for any $i \in N$, it is possible that both $L(i, x)$ and $L(i, y)$ are true when $x \neq y$. However, we require the inverse of $L$ to be a function; which means that in $L(i, x)$, given $x \in E$, it reverse maps to a unique $i \in N$.

$L$ scans the entire domain $E$ from edge 1 to edge $m$. As it does so, it keeps a running count of the number of elements in $E$ that are also members of $F$ (that is, it keeps a running count of the number of matched edges).

If edge 1 is matched, then it is assigned index one; otherwise it is assigned index zero. From this point onwards the recursion formulas take over.

Here is the basic idea behind our recursion formulas. Assume that an edge $x \in E$ is assigned an index $i \in N$, that is, let $L(i, x)$ be true. Then, for the next edge $(x+1)$, if it is a matched edge, we increment the index to $(i + 1)$, that is, set $L(i + 1, x + 1)$ to true. On the other hand, if $(x + 1)$ is unmatched, we leave the index unchanged; that is, set the index for edge $(x + 1)$ to $i$ (which means setting $L(i, x + 1)$ to true).

If edge $x \in E$ is *mapped* to an index $i \in N$, we say that:
(i) Edge $x$ has been *assigned* index $i$;
(ii) $L(i, x)$ is true; and
(iii) The number of matched edges in the set $\{e_j \mid j \in [1, x]\}$ is equal to $i$.

## 1.3 Directed bipartite graph

It will be helpful to look at the relation $L$ as a directed bipartite graph $G_b = (N, E, L)$. The elements of $N$ are placed on the left in a vertical column, with vertex "0" at the bottom and vertex "$m$" at the top. Similarly on the right side, we have vertices from $E$ in a column with vertex "$e_1$" at the bottom and "$e_m$" at the top.

This is an *output* graph, that is, it represents a *solution* obtained after we run the algorithm.

Note that $N$ has one more member than $E$. For $i \in [1, m]$, place vertices $i \in N$ and $e_i \in E$ at the same horizontal level. Then vertex $0 \in N$ is one level below the vertices $1 \in N$ and $e_1 \in E$.

The directed edges in $G_b$ go from left to right (from $N$ to $E$). For a vertex $i \in N$, its out-degree is given by out-degree$(i) \geq 0$. However, for a vertex $e_s \in E$, we will require its in-degree to be one (exactly one arc arrives at $e_s$).

Let us say that an index $i \in N$ is *active* if $i$ it is assigned at least one edge in $E$ and *inactive* otherwise. Recall that the purpose of the indices is to maintain a running count of the number of edges matched. Hence:

**Remark 3.** *If index $i$ is active, then all indices less than $i$ (except perhaps zero) should be active. As for index zero, it will be active if and only if the first edge ($e_1$) is unmatched.* □

## 2 BFC for Matching

The BFC for Problem 1 can be written as a Horn formula:

$$\phi_{\mathrm{M}} \equiv \forall xy\ [E(x) \wedge E(y) \wedge W(x, y)] \rightarrow [\neg F(x) \vee \neg F(y)]. \tag{1}$$

$E(x)$ is true if and only if $x$ is an edge in $E$. $W(x, y)$ is true if and only if edges $x$ and $y$ share a common vertex in $G$. $F(x)$ is true if and only if the edge $x$ is matched. The *known* predicates are $E$ and $W$, whereas $F$ is *unknown*.

We can rewrite (1) as follows:

$$\phi_{\mathrm{M}} \equiv \bigwedge_{(x, y)\, \in\, \mathcal{E}} [\neg F(x) \vee \neg F(y)], \tag{2}$$

where $\mathcal{E}$ is the set of all $(x, y)$ pairs such that $x$ and $y$ are edges in $E$, and they share a common vertex.

## 3 A combined system of constraints for the OFC and the BFC

We should express the OFC that $|F| \geq K$.

Carsten Sinz [3] provided a Horn formula, but his formula is for the upper bound $|F| \leq K$. Though his formula could be adapted for lower bounds (as he has himself suggested in his paper), we develop our own formula in this paper.

An expression for the lower bound appears in [1].

### 3.1 Modifications to L

**Remark 4.** *(a) We define that edge $x$ is assigned an index $i$ if and only if $L(i, x)$ is true.*

*(b) For edge $m$, we will never use variables $L(i, m)$ where $i \in [0, K-1]$ in any clause.*

*(c) We will never use variables $L(i, j)$ where $i > j$ in any of our clauses.* □

*Example 1*:
Let $E = \{e_i \mid i \in [1,\ 10]\}$. Let the set $F$ of *matched* edges be $F = \{1,\ 3,\ 7,\ 9\}$. Then the table of mappings would be as below. The matched edges are in bold.

| Index $i$ | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Edge $x$ | **1** | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 | 6 | **7** | 8 | **9** | 10 |

Edge 5 is assigned index 2 because up to that point, two edges (1 and 3) have been matched. $L(2,\ 5)$ is true. $L(i,\ 5)$ is false for every $i \neq 5$.

Edge 9 is assigned index 4 because up to that point, four edges (1, 3, 7 and 9) have been matched. $L(4,\ 9)$ is true. $L(i,\ 9)$ is false for every $i \neq 4$.

$L(i,\ 10)$ is false for every $i \neq 4$. As for index zero, $L(0,\ e)$ is set to false for every edge $e$, since no edge is assigned this index.

The question as to whether $L(0,\ 10)$ is true doesn't arise, since this variable will never be used in our constraints (part (b) of Remark 4).

*Example 2*:
$E = \{e_i \mid i \in [1, 10]\}$ and $F = \{3,\ 7,\ 9,\ 10\}$ would result in the following mapping table:

| Index $i$ | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Edge $x$ | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 | 6 | **7** | 8 | **9** | **10** |

Edges 1 and 2 are assigned index zero because up to that point, no edge has been matched. We see that $L(0,\ 1)$ and $L(0,\ 2)$ are set to true. $L(0,\ e)$ will be set to false for every edge $e$ other than 1 and 2.

Again, the issue of whether $L(0,\ 10)$ is true is none of our concern.

## 3.2 Properties of lines L in the output graph $G_b$

Any reference to "edge $x$" in this section (Sec. 3) will refer to an edge in the given (input) graph $G = (V, E)$, *not* in the (output) bipartite graph $G_b$.

This subsection is to help the reader understand $L$. There are no definitions, constraints or proofs.

### 3.2.1 No downward slopes

Recall that $N$, the set of indices, is defined as $\{i \mid 0 \leq i \leq m\}$, where $m$ is the number of the edges in the given graph $G = (V, E)$.

In all our constraints, only variables $L(i,\ j)$ where $i \leq j$ will be used. Moving from the left set $N$ to the right set $E$ in $G_b$, the slopes of the lines in $L$ will always be non-negative. Thus we will never use variables of the form $L(i,\ j)$ where $i > j$.

The slope of any line $L(i,\ j)$ is either flat or upward.

If the slope is flat at Level $j$ (that is, if edge $j$ is assigned index $j$), this means that for every level below $j$, that is, for every $p \in [1,\ j-1]$,

1. Edge $p$ is matched (that is, $F_p$ is true); and

2. At Level $p$, the slope is flat ($L(p,\ p)$ is true).

A flat slope at Level $j \in [1,\ m]$ would mean that $L(j,\ j)$ is true. As we move up from any edge $j$ to edge $(j+1)$ where $j \in E - \{m\}$, the slope will either increase or remain the same (never decrease).

### 3.2.2 Parallel lines (with equal slopes)

Let the slopes of two lines in $G_b$ be parallel. In other words, assume that edge $x$ is assigned index $i$, edge $y$ is assigned $j$, and $(x-i) = (j-y)$. This implies that every edge in the interval between them is matched, including $y$ (but we are unable to say whether $x$ is matched).

That is, if $L(i,\ x)$ and $L(j,\ y)$ are true for $1 \leq i < j \leq m$, $1 \leq x < y \leq m$ and $(x-i) = (j-y)$, then every edge in the interval $[(x+1),\ y]$ is matched.

The parallel lines system is applied in Constraint (13).

We can now begin writing down the constraints one by one.

## 3.3 The cardinality constraint

The cardinality condition that the "index of edge $m$ should be at least $K$" could be written as a conjunction of $K$ unit clauses:

$$\eta(1) \equiv \bigwedge_{i \in [0,\ K-1]} \neg L(i,\ m). \tag{3}$$

(A unit clause is a clause with only one literal.)

However, we can do something simpler. We will never use these variables $L(i,\ m)$, where $i \in [0,\ K-1]$, in any of our clauses. Hence constraint (3) is unnecessary and it can be ignored.

Later in Sec. 3.5.2, we will ensure that every edge is assigned at least one index. This and the uniqueness condition below will ensure that edge $m$ is assigned exactly one index in the range $[K,\ m]$.

## 3.4 Uniqueness of mapping for edges

We will ensure that every edge $x \in E$ is assigned a unique index $i \in N$.

Considering $L(i,\ x)$ and $L(j,\ x)$, assume w.l.o.g. that $i < j$. For edge $x$ where $x \in [1,\ m]$:

$$\eta(2) \ \equiv \ \neg L(i,\ x) \vee \neg L(j,\ x). \tag{4}$$

Recall that we neither need nor use variables $L(i,\ x)$ where $i > x$.

As a special case, for the first edge $e_1$, the only possibilities for $i$ and $j$ are $i = 0$ and $j = 1$. If edge $e_1$ is matched, then we need $L(1,\ 1)$ to be true, otherwise we need $L(0,\ 1)$ to be true. We state that the two variables cannot be simultaneously true:

$$\eta(3) \ \equiv \ \equiv \ \neg L(1,\ 1) \vee \neg L(0,\ 1). \tag{5}$$

### 3.5 Main mapping L: forward recursion

This is forward recursion; recursion from the ground up.

#### 3.5.1 The different cases for different edges

(a) If edge $e_1$ is matched, then $L(1,\ 1)$ should be set as true, otherwise $L(0,\ 1)$ should be set as true:

$$\eta(5) \equiv L(1,\ 1) \vee L(0,\ 1). \tag{6}$$

Variable $L(i,\ 1)$ is undefined for $i \geq 2$. Thus the choice of indices in $N$ for edge $e_1$ is restricted to the set $\{0,\ 1\}$.

(c) For $x \in [1,\ m-1]$ and $i \in [0,\ x]$, if edge $x$ is assigned a non-zero index $i$, then the next edge $(x+1)$ is assigned either $i$ or $(i+1)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \eta(8) \ &\equiv \ L(i,\ x) \rightarrow \big[L(i,\ x+1) \vee L(i+1,\ x+1)\big] \\ &\equiv \ \neg L(i,\ x) \vee L(i,\ x+1) \vee L(i+1,\ x+1). \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

But let us tighten this. If $x$ is assigned index $i$, then let us ensure that edge $(x+1)$ will be assigned *only* indices $i$ or $(i+1)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \eta(9) \ &\equiv \ L(i,\ x) \rightarrow \left[\bigwedge_{j \in [0,\ x+1],\ j \notin \{i,\ i+1\}} \neg L(j,\ x+1)\right] \\ &\equiv \bigwedge_{j \in [0,\ x+1],\ j \notin \{i,\ i+1\}} \big[\neg L(i,\ x) \vee \neg L(j,\ x+1)\big]. \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

When $i = K-1$, since $L(K-1,\ m)$ is undefined, Equation (7) becomes as follows, forcing edge $m$ to be matched (and hence assigned index $K$):

$$\eta(10b) \ \equiv \ L(K-1,\ m-1) \rightarrow L(K,\ m) \ \equiv \ \neg L(K-1,\ m-1) \vee L(K,\ m). \tag{9}$$

Recall that variables $L(j,\ m)$ are undefined for $j \in [0,\ K-1]$ (part (b) of Remark 4).

Thus for every edge in $E$, we have restricted its choice of indices in $N$ to at most two. The uniqueness conditions in Sec. 3.4 and the matching definitions in Sec. 3.7 will enforce that exactly one of these two indices will be chosen for every edge.

#### 3.5.2 At least one index for every edge

It is easy to show that every edge in $E$ is assigned an index $i$ in $N$.

The first edge $e_1$ is assigned an index (zero or one), as per (6). From then on, the recursion equations (7) take over and assign an index to every edge.

**Lemma 5.** *The recursion defined by (6) and (7) ensure that every edge in $E$ is assigned at least one index in $N$.* □

### 3.6 Tightly coupled systems

The three events $L(i,\, x)$, $F(x+1)$ and $L(i+1,\, x+1)$ form a tightly coupled system for $i \in [1,\, m-1]$ and $x \in [1,\, m-1]$. If two of them are true, then so is the third.

Similarly, the three events $L(i,\, x)$, $\neg F(x+1)$ and $L(i,\, x+1)$ form a tightly coupled system for the same values of $i$ and $x$ as above.

The three sections, 3.7, 3.8 and 3.9, each define the truth of the third event in terms of the other two.

(a) As we go up from edge $x$ to $(x+1)$, the index is incremented if and only if the succeeding edge $(x+1)$ is matched. (Sec. 3.8)

(b) Similarly, as we move downwards from edge $(x+1)$ to $x$, the index to which $x$ gets assigned depends on whether $(x+1)$ is matched. (Sec. 3.9)

(c) Is edge $x$ matched? This depends on whether $(x-1)$ is assigned the same index as $x$, or the one below. (Sec. 3.7)

The constraints in Sections 3.7 and 3.8 together enforce the following condition: If edge $x$ is assigned index $i$, then exactly one of the following is true about edge $(x+1)$:

Either (i) it is assigned index $(i+1)$ and it is matched,
or (ii) it is assigned index $i$ and it is unmatched.

### 3.7 Defining whether an edge is matched

In Sec. 3.5, we were able to restrict the choice of indices for every edge to at most two. In this subsection, by defining a matching $F(x)$ for every edge $x$, we can restrict this choice to one (since $F(x)$ can be true or false, not both).

We now define which edges are matched and which ones are not.

We define an edge $x$ to be *matched* if $F(x)$ is true, and *unmatched* (or *not matched*) if $F(x)$ is false.

(a) From (5) and (6), we can state the conditions for the first edge, edge $e_1$:

$$\begin{aligned} \eta(12) &\equiv L(1,\, 1) \rightarrow F(1) &&\equiv \neg L(1,\, 1) \vee F(1) \\ \eta(13) &\equiv L(0,\, 1) \rightarrow \neg F(1) &&\equiv \neg L(0,\, 1) \vee \neg F(1). \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

(b) If an edge $x$ is assigned index zero, clearly it should not be matched. For edge $x$, where $x \in [2,\ m-1]$, we define:

$$\eta(14) \equiv L(0,\, x) \rightarrow \neg F(x) \equiv \neg L(0,\, x) \vee \neg F(x). \tag{11}$$

(c) For $x \geq 2$, if the index of edge $x$ is zero, then every edge $p$ in the set $[1,\ x-1]$ will also have an index of zero (and hence be unmatched):

$$\begin{aligned} \eta(15) &\equiv L(0,\, x) \rightarrow L(0,\, x-1) \\ &\equiv \neg L(0,\, x) \vee L(0,\, x-1). \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

(d) Edge $x$, where $x \in [2,\ m-1]$, is matched if edges $x$ and $(x-1)$ are assigned different indices in $N$:

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{For } i \geq 1)\ \ \eta(16) &\equiv \big[L(i,\ x) \wedge L(i-1,\ x-1)\big] \rightarrow F(x) \\ &\equiv \neg L(i,\ x) \vee \neg L(i-1,\ x-1) \vee F(x). \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

(e) Edge $x$, where $x \in [2,\ m-1]$, is *not* matched if edges $x$ and $(x-1)$ are assigned the same index in $N$:

$$\begin{aligned} \eta(18) &\equiv [L(i,\ x) \wedge L(i,\ x-1)] \rightarrow \neg F(x) \\ &\equiv \neg L(i,\ x) \vee \neg L(i,\ x-1) \vee \neg F(x). \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

Obviously an algorithm will set $F(m)$ to be either true or false, not both. If it is chosen to be true, then the unique index for edge $m$ will be $(i+1)$, otherwise it is $i$.

### 3.8 Forward recursion revisited

Having defined matching $F(x)$ for every edge $x$, we can rewrite forward recursion in terms of matching. As we go up from edge $x$ to $(x+1)$, the index $i$ is incremented if and only if the succeeding edge $(x+1)$ is matched.

(a) For $x \in [1,\ m-1]$ and $i \in [1, x]$, if edge $x$ is assigned a non-zero index $i$, then the next edge $(x+1)$ is assigned either $i$ or $(i+1)$, depending on the value of $F(x+1)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \eta(8b) &\equiv \big[L(i,\ x) \wedge F(x+1)\big] \rightarrow L(i+1,\ x+1) \\ &\equiv \neg L(i,\ x) \vee \neg F(x+1) \vee L(i+1,\ x+1). \\ \eta(8c) &\equiv \big[L(i,\ x) \wedge \neg F(x+1)\big] \rightarrow L(i,\ x+1) \\ &\equiv \neg L(i,\ x) \vee F(x+1) \vee L(i,\ x+1). \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

If $L(K-1,\ m-1)$ is true, then edge $m$ must be matched:

$$\begin{aligned} \eta(10d) &\equiv L(K-1,\ m-1) \rightarrow \big[F(m) \wedge L(K,\ m)\big] \\ &\equiv \big[\neg L(K-1,\ m-1) \vee F(m)\big] \wedge \big[\neg L(K-1,\ m-1) \vee L(K,\ m)\big]. \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

The result in Lemma 5 could also have been derived from the three constraints in this subsection alone.

### 3.9 Backward recursion

If edge $x$ is assigned index $i$, how can we be sure that the previous edge $(x-1)$ is assigned either $i$ or $(i-1)$? We ensure this property in this subsection.

This is recursion from top to bottom (edge $m$ to edge 1).

If edge $x$ is assigned index $i$, then the previous edge $(x-1)$ should be assigned either $i$ or $(i-1)$, depending on the status of edge $x$ (whether it is matched).

The case when $i = 0$ was treated in (11) and (12).

(a) For edge $x$ where $x \in [2,\ m]$ and index $i \in [1,\ m-1]$:

$$\begin{aligned} \eta(22) &\equiv \big[L(i,\ x) \wedge F(x)\big] \rightarrow L(i-1,\ x-1) \equiv \neg L(i,\ x) \vee \neg F(x) \vee L(i-1,\ x-1). \\ \eta(23) &\equiv \big[L(i,\ x) \wedge \neg F(x)\big] \rightarrow L(i,\ x-1) \equiv \neg L(i,\ x) \vee F(x) \vee L(i,\ x-1). \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

(b) If $L$ is flat at Level $p$, then $L$ is flat at every level below $p$:

$$\eta(24) \equiv L(p,\ p) \rightarrow L(p-1,\ p-1) \equiv \neg L(p,\ p) \vee L(p-1,\ p-1),\ p \in [2,\ m]. \tag{18}$$

Combining the above with (13) in Sec. 3.7, this means that all edges in the range $[1,\ p]$ are matched.

Next, we fit the BFC in Sec. 2 into mapping $L$.

### 3.10 Embedding the BFC into the Main mapping

(The ideas in this section are due to L. Brankovic. I thank her for this.)

Consider the case when an edge $x$ is assigned an index $i$. From Sec. 3.5, we know that if the next edge $(x+1)$ is matched, its index is set to $(i+1)$; otherwise its index remains the same as that of edge $x$, which is $i$.

Now consider two different edges $x$ and $y$. Assume w.l.o.g. that $x < y$. Assume that $W(x,\ y)$ is true, that is, edges $x$ and $y$ meet at a common vertex in $V$. Then at least one of these two edges should be unmatched. In other words, either
(i) Edges $x$ and $(x-1)$ should share the same index; or
(ii) Edges $y$ and $(y-1)$ should share the same index; or
(iii) Both (i) and (ii).

This is expressed as below. Assume that edges $x$ and $y$ are assigned indices $i$ and $j$ respectively. In Cases (a) and (b), the satisfaction of the BFC is immediately clear. Only for Cases (c) and (d), we are required to write the conditions explicitly.

(a) If $i = j$:

This means that all edges in the set $\{x+1, \cdots, y\}$ are assigned the same index. Constraint (14) implies that all these edges, including $y$, are unmatched. Hence the BFC is satisfied.

(b) If $i = 0$ and $i < j$:

Constraint (12) implies that edge $x$ is unmatched, hence satisfying the BFC regardless of whether $y$ is matched. (Also, for $p \leq x$, every edge $p$ is unmatched.)

(c) If $0 < i < j$ and $y \leq m$:

$$\begin{aligned} \eta(25) &\equiv \big[L(i,\ x) \wedge L(j,\ y)\big] \rightarrow [L(i,\ x-1) \vee L(j,\ y-1)] \\ &\equiv \neg L(i,\ x) \vee \neg L(j,y) \vee L(i,\ x-1) \vee L(j,\ y-1). \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

Applying (14), we can also express this as:

$$\begin{aligned} \eta(26) &\equiv \big[L(i,\ x) \wedge L(j,\ y)\big] \rightarrow \big[\neg F(x) \vee \neg F(y)\big] \\ &\equiv \neg L(i,\ x) \vee \neg L(j,\ y) \vee \neg F(x) \vee \neg F(y). \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

A special case arises when $i = x$:

If $i = x$, that is, if $L$ is flat at Level $x$, then we know from (13) and (18) that edge $x$ is a matched edge, and that $L(x,\ x)$ and $F(x)$ are true. Then $\neg F(x)$ is false and hence can be removed from the equation. Also, there is no such variable $L(x,\ x-1)$ (from the last part of Def. 4).

Since $x$ is matched, edge $y$ should be *unmatched*. The two constraints above simplify to

$\neg L(x,\ x) \vee \neg L(j,\ y) \vee L(j,\ y-1)$ and $\neg L(x,\ x) \vee \neg L(j,\ y) \vee \neg F(y)$

respectively.

But what if $j = y$? Then the slope is flat at Level $y$ and hence edge $y$ is matched. We should apply Eq. (18). This would mean that the slope is flat at every level below $y$, including level $x$, hence edge $x$ is also matched. Thus both edges $x$ and $y$ will have to be matched. Hence for such $(x,\ y)$ pairs of edges, we enforce that

$$\eta(27) \ \equiv \ \neg L(y,\ y). \tag{21}$$

(*This subsection is probably unnecessary, since the BFC in Sec. 2 has negative literals in every clause.*)

# 4 Conclusion

Every clause in the system of constraints in Sec. 3 has a polynomial number of literals. In fact, every clause has at most four literals. Every clause except (6) has at least one negative literal. The number of constraints is also polynomial in $n$.

If (6) can also be converted to a clause with at least one negative literal, then from [2], it follows that:

**Theorem 6.** *The system of constraints in Sec. 3, from (4) onwards, can be solved in time polynomial in $n$.*

## 4.1 For future versions of this paper: Possible further restrictions to L

We could restrict $L$ further, based on the cardinality constraint.

Restrictions for $E$:
For every edge $x$, we could define a range of indices to which $x$ could be assigned and leave other indices undefined (for $x$).

To start, for edge $(m-1)$, its defined range of indices will be $[K-1,\ m-1]$. Hence $L(i,\ x)$ where $i \notin [K-1,\ m-1]$ can be left undefined (and thus not used in any clause).

In general, the defined range of indices for edge $(m-i)$, for $i \in [0,\ K]$ would be $[K-i,\ m-i]$.

Restrictions for $N$:
Since we require that $|F| \geq K$, at most $m-K$ edges can be assigned an index of zero. Hence this index can be assigned to edges in the range $[1,\ m-K]$.

In general, index $i$, where $i \in [0,\ K]$, can be restricted to edges in the range $[i,\ m-K+i]$.

### 4.2 Further Notes

(a) We have enforced the uniqueness condition for each edge in two ways; in Sections 3.4 and 3.5. I suppose that one of these could be dropped (perhaps the one in Sec. 3.4).

(b) Embedding the BFC into mapping $L$ (Sec. 3.10) is probably unnecessary, since the BFC in Sec. 2 has at least one negative literal in every clause.

(c) I think the 3 sections, BFC (Sec. 2), "Forward recursion revisited" (Sec. 3.8) and "Defining Matching" (Sec. 3.7) are sufficient to define the problem.

### 4.3 Acknowledgement

I am grateful to Ljiljana Brankovic for contributing Subsection 3.10.

## References

[1] Said Jabbour, Lakhdar Sais and Yakoub Salhi. A Pigeon-Hole Based Encoding of Cardinality Constraints. In *International Symposium on Artificial Intelligence and Mathematics, ISAIM 2014*, Fort Lauderdale, FL, USA, January 6-8, 2014.

[2] Thomas J. Schaefer. The complexity of satisfiability problems. In *Proceedings of the Tenth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC '78, pages 216–226, New York, NY, USA, 1978. ACM.

[3] Carsten Sinz. Towards an optimal CNF encoding of boolean cardinality constraints. In Peter van Beek, editor, *Principles and Practice of Constraint Programming - CP 2005*, volume 3709 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 827–831. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2005.